



JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.
Governor

GARY R. HERBERT
Lieutenant Governor

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER
Executive Director

Division of Oil Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA
Division Director

Internal
M0370088

February 28, 2008

TO: Susan White, Mining Program Coordinator *SMW*
FROM: Beth Ericksen, Mining Engineer *BE*
Subject: Lisbon Valley Mining Co. Surety Reduction Request, M/037/088
Task # 2206

Lisbon Valley Mining Company (LVMC) has submitted a request for a bond reduction of \$563,132.00. Due to missing data, lack of identified assumptions and explanations, evaluative inconsistencies, and lack of transparency in the final bond estimate spreadsheet received by the Division on Feb. 6, 2008, the requested reduction is not recommended.

A general overview of the discrepancies/inconsistencies is outlined as follows:

- Bond calculations include missing or inconsistent acreage
- Spreadsheet numbers do not 'add up'
- No explanation of general or specific assumptions is provided
- No explanation of surety calculations is provided in the plan
- No approved bond scheme is provided in the plan

Due to the lack of demonstrative documentation, the dollar amount of the requested bond reduction cannot be verified. No explanation or outline documentation regarding the surety amount, surety details, or outline of surety plan has been found in the Notice of Intention. Important and necessary detail is lacking or missing in both the final bond estimate and in the current request for bond reduction.

It appears LVMC calculated a bond requirement based on an ultimate reclamation scenario as \$10,172,230 in 2009 dollars. The existing surety with the Division is \$6,076,888.00 *assumed* to be based on current reclamation obligation.



080001

Further emphasis substantiating the denial is structured in terms of a scenario. There are several other bond categories that are being ignored in this scenario, with this scenario directed toward the heap/rinse category only. It is determined that heap/rinse is the highest reclamation cost risk based largely on lack of information.

The scenario is outlined below:

The ultimate reclamation obligation is determined to be \$10,722,230 based on information contained in the LVMC Final Bond Estimate spreadsheet. Due to an assumed bond scheme, the bond obligation is calculated at current reclamation obligation of \$6,076,880.00 as determined by LVMC. According to the LVMC current estimate, there is \$3,005,872.00 committed to heap/rinse work. This amount is 49% of the current reclamation obligation. Looking at the ultimate reclamation bond amount, the heap/rinse work obligation is 58% of the total ultimate surety. With full disturbance for each case, this percentage should be consistent.

Assigning 58% of the current reclamation obligation results in a heap/rinse amount of \$3,524,595.00. This increase of \$518,723.00 is less than the requested reduction amount but it is without consideration for unknowns and omissions.

Performing a range analysis using a 65th percentile, the dedicated bond for the LVMC current heap/rinse category should be \$4,358,514.00. This scenario alone is enough to deny the request for the surety reduction because of the number of unknowns associated with the heap/rinse. These unknowns include: reclamation details, category specifics, and rinse duration, among others.

In the ultimate vs. current case, the difference does not exceed the reduction request amount, however, once increased risk due to uncertainties is conservatively assigned, the required amount increases substantially in just one reclamation category.

With all the unknowns and uncertainty revolving around the heap/rinse category, a conservative estimate that includes risk should be established. It is in the best interest of the Division to determine an element of risk associated with each of the surety categories. The presented example was for only one of the five main categories (there are sub-categories as well).

To reduce risk factors, resolve inconsistencies, and improve reclamation bond calculation transparency, it will be necessary for the LVMC to satisfactorily identify and explain the full basis and scope of the bond scheme. The bond scheme should be substantially documented in the NOI including identification of category make-up, general and detailed assumptions, and the surety estimate. The operator should be required to provide a much more comprehensive spreadsheet with supporting

LVMC

Page 3 of 3

February 28, 2008

documentation before any future bond reduction requests are considered by the Division.

2008 Interim Bond Estimate
Lisbon Valley Mining Co
La Sal, Utah

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---------|-----------|----------------------------------|---------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Summo USA Corporation- Lisbon Valley Copper Project. Updated to reflect anticipated 06 and 07 disturbance. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Based on Details of Final Reclamation original estimate prepared by The Winters Group 1997 | | | | | | | | | | |
| ACTIVITY | AREA | QUANTITY | UNITS | \$/Unit | 1997 \$ Cost | 2004 \$ Cost | 2006 \$ Cost | 2007 \$ Cost | 2008 \$ Cost | 2009 \$ Cost |
| Waste Dump A- 190 acres | | | | | | | | | | |
| area of top | 456,444 | | SY | | | | | | | |
| area of slope | 462,680 | | SY | | | | | | | |
| scarify top (flat) area | | 456,444 | SY | 0.20 | \$ 91,289 | \$ 109,108 | \$ 113,110 | \$ 114,309 | \$ 117,966 | \$ 121,741 |
| 12 inches soil on top of dump | | 152,148 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 190,185 | \$ 227,308 | \$ 235,644 | \$ 238,142 | \$ 245,763 | \$ 253,627 |
| 12 inches soil on slope | | 154,227 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 192,784 | \$ 230,415 | \$ 238,865 | \$ 241,397 | \$ 249,121 | \$ 257,093 |
| seed entire surface | | 190 | acre | 174 | \$ 33,060 | \$ 39,513 | \$ 40,962 | \$ 41,396 | \$ 42,721 | \$ 44,088 |
| Total-waste dump "A" reclamation | | | | | \$ 507,318 | \$ 606,344 | \$ 628,581 | \$ 635,244 | \$ 655,572 | \$ 676,550 0% |
| Waste Dump B- 94 acres | | | | | | | | | | |
| area of the top | 197,222 | | SY | | | | | | | |
| area of the slope | 258,240 | | SY | | | | | | | |
| scarify top (flat) area | | 197,222 | SY | 0.20 | \$ 39,444 | \$ 47,143 | \$ 48,872 | \$ 49,390 | \$ 50,971 | \$ 52,602 |
| 12 inches soil on top of dump | | 65,741 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 82,176 | \$ 98,216 | \$ 101,818 | \$ 102,898 | \$ 106,190 | \$ 109,588 |
| 12 inches soil on slope | | 86,080 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 107,600 | \$ 128,603 | \$ 133,319 | \$ 134,733 | \$ 139,044 | \$ 143,493 |
| seed entire surface | | 94 | acre | 174 | \$ 16,356 | \$ 19,549 | \$ 20,266 | \$ 20,480 | \$ 21,136 | \$ 21,812 |
| Total-waste dump "B" reclamation | | | | | \$ 245,576 | \$ 293,511 | \$ 304,275 | \$ 307,501 | \$ 317,341 | \$ 327,496 40% 130,998 |
| Waste Dump C- 120 acres | | | | | | | | | | |
| area of the top | 344,222 | | SY | | | | | | | |
| area of the slope | 238,633 | | SY | | | | | | | |
| scarify top (flat) area | | 344,222 | SY | 0.20 | \$ 68,844 | \$ 82,282 | \$ 85,300 | \$ 86,204 | \$ 88,962 | \$ 91,809 |
| 12 inches soil on top of dump | | 114,741 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 143,426 | \$ 171,422 | \$ 177,709 | \$ 179,592 | \$ 185,339 | \$ 191,270 |
| 12 inches soil on slope | | 79,544 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 99,430 | \$ 118,838 | \$ 123,196 | \$ 124,502 | \$ 128,486 | \$ 132,598 |
| seed entire surface | | 120 | acre | 174 | \$ 20,880 | \$ 24,956 | \$ 25,871 | \$ 26,145 | \$ 26,982 | \$ 27,845 |
| Total-waste dump "C" reclamation | | | | | \$ 332,580 | \$ 397,498 | \$ 412,076 | \$ 416,444 | \$ 429,770 | \$ 443,523 100% 443,523 |
| Rinse Heap- 12%of total ore neutralized; rinsing & evaporation for 18 months | | | | | | | | | | |
| lime (2.5 lbs/ton)x(\$0.025/lb)x(5.9M ton) | | 1,320,000 | ton | 0.063 | \$ 83,160 | \$ 99,392 | \$ 103,038 | \$ 104,130 | \$ 107,462 | \$ 110,901 |
| labor, power & pump for draindown & evaporation for 18 months | | 1 | lot | 99,926 | \$ 99,926 | \$ 119,431 | \$ 123,811 | \$ 125,124 | \$ 129,128 | \$ 133,260 |
| Subtotal for heap rinse & evaporation | | | | | \$ 183,086 | \$ 218,824 | \$ 226,849 | \$ 229,253 | \$ 236,590 | \$ 244,160 100% 244,160 |
| area of the top | 578,976 | | SY | | | | | | | |
| area of the slope | 81,719 | | SY | | | | | | | |
| 12 inches clay cap on top | | 192,799 | CY | 2.50 | \$ 481,998 | \$ 576,081 | \$ 597,208 | \$ 603,538 | \$ 622,852 | \$ 642,783 |
| 12 inches clay cap on slope | | 27,212 | CY | 2.50 | \$ 68,031 | \$ 81,310 | \$ 84,292 | \$ 85,186 | \$ 87,912 | \$ 90,725 |
| 24 inch crushed rock on top | | 385,598 | CY | 2.50 | \$ 963,995 | \$ 1,152,162 | \$ 1,194,416 | \$ 1,207,077 | \$ 1,245,703 | \$ 1,285,566 |
| 24 inch crushed rock on slope | | 54,425 | CY | 2.50 | \$ 136,062 | \$ 162,821 | \$ 168,585 | \$ 170,372 | \$ 175,824 | \$ 181,450 |
| 12 inches soil on top | | 192,799 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 240,999 | \$ 288,041 | \$ 298,604 | \$ 301,769 | \$ 311,426 | \$ 321,391 |
| 12 inches soil on slope | | 27,212 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 34,016 | \$ 40,855 | \$ 42,146 | \$ 42,593 | \$ 43,956 | \$ 45,362 |
| seed entire surface | | 178 | acre | 174 | \$ 30,972 | \$ 37,018 | \$ 38,375 | \$ 38,782 | \$ 40,023 | \$ 41,304 |
| Subtotal- clay, crushed rock, soil & seeding for leach pad | | | | | \$ 1,956,072 | \$ 2,337,888 | \$ 2,423,827 | \$ 2,449,317 | \$ 2,527,695 | \$ 2,608,581 100% 2,608,581 |
| Reclamation of Miscellaneous Areas | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pond Area- 11 Acres | | | | | | | | | | |
| refillate pond- 12 inches soil | | 4,853 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 6,065 | \$ 7,249 | \$ 7,515 | \$ 7,594 | \$ 7,837 | \$ 8,088 |
| PLS pond- 12 inches soil | | 4,852 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 6,065 | \$ 7,249 | \$ 7,515 | \$ 7,594 | \$ 7,837 | \$ 8,088 |
| ILS pond- 12 inches soil | | 4,852 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 6,065 | \$ 7,436 | \$ 7,594 | \$ 7,837 | \$ 9,916 | \$ 10,452 |
| water runoff pond- 12 inches soil | | 8,229 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 10,286 | \$ 12,294 | \$ 12,745 | \$ 12,880 | \$ 13,292 | \$ 13,717 |
| seed 4 pond areas | | 14 | acre | 174 | \$ 2,436 | \$ 2,911 | \$ 3,018 | \$ 3,050 | \$ 3,148 | \$ 3,249 |
| Total-Pond Area reclamation | | | | | \$ 30,917 | \$ 37,139 | \$ 38,387 | \$ 38,956 | \$ 42,031 | \$ 43,594 100% 43,594 |
| Plant & Crusher Area- 25.5 Acres | | | | | | | | | | |
| apply 12 inches soil | | 41,080 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 51,350 | \$ 61,373 | \$ 63,624 | \$ 64,298 | \$ 66,356 | \$ 68,479 |
| seed entire plant area | | 26 | acre | 174 | \$ 4,437 | \$ 5,303 | \$ 5,498 | \$ 5,556 | \$ 5,734 | \$ 5,917 |
| Total- Plant Area Reclamation | | | | | \$ 55,787 | \$ 66,676 | \$ 69,122 | \$ 69,854 | \$ 72,090 | \$ 74,397 100% 74,397 |
| Haul Roads- 40 Acres | | | | | | | | | | |
| scarify | | 192,889 | SY | 0.20 | \$ 38,578 | \$ 46,108 | \$ 47,799 | \$ 48,306 | \$ 49,852 | \$ 51,447 |
| contour | | 64,296 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 80,370 | \$ 96,058 | \$ 99,581 | \$ 100,636 | \$ 103,857 | \$ 107,180 |
| apply 12 inches soil | | 67,511 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 84,389 | \$ 100,861 | \$ 104,560 | \$ 105,669 | \$ 109,050 | \$ 112,540 |
| seed entire area | | 40 | acre | 174 | \$ 6,960 | \$ 8,319 | \$ 8,624 | \$ 8,715 | \$ 8,994 | \$ 9,282 |
| Total- Plant Reclamation Area | | | | | \$ 210,297 | \$ 251,346 | \$ 260,564 | \$ 263,326 | \$ 271,752 | \$ 280,448 100% 280,448 |
| Power Line Corridor- 64 Acres | | | | | | | | | | |
| *note the power company has requested the line remain open | | 64 | acre | n/c | \$ - | | | | | |
| Reseed Soil Stockpile Areas- 40 Acres | | | | | | | | | | |
| reseed 40 acres | | 40 | acre | 174 | \$ 6,960 | \$ 8,319 | \$ 8,624 | \$ 8,715 | \$ 8,994 | \$ 9,282 |
| Total- Reseed Soil Stock Pile Areas | | | | | \$ 6,960 | \$ 8,319 | \$ 8,624 | \$ 8,715 | \$ 8,994 | \$ 9,282 33% 3,063 |
| Fences & Berms Around Open Pits | | | | | | | | | | |
| fence around Sentinel Pit 1 | | 5,620 | LF | 3.02 | \$ 16,972 | \$ 20,285 | \$ 21,029 | \$ 21,252 | \$ 21,932 | \$ 22,634 |
| fence around Sentinel Pit 2 | | 2,140 | LF | 3.02 | \$ 6,463 | \$ 7,725 | \$ 8,008 | \$ 8,093 | \$ 8,352 | \$ 8,619 |
| fence around Centennial Pit | | 8,980 | LF | 3.02 | \$ 27,120 | \$ 32,414 | \$ 33,602 | \$ 33,959 | \$ 35,045 | \$ 36,167 |
| fence around GTO Pit | | 7,410 | LF | 3.02 | \$ 22,378 | \$ 26,746 | \$ 27,727 | \$ 28,021 | \$ 28,918 | \$ 29,843 |
| Total - Pit Fences | | | | | \$ 72,933 | \$ 87,169 | \$ 90,366 | \$ 91,324 | \$ 94,246 | \$ 97,262 100% 97,262 |
| Surface Drainage Diversion Ditches | | | | | | | | | | |
| leach pad area | | 7,473 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 9,341 | \$ 11,164 | \$ 11,574 | \$ 11,696 | \$ 12,071 | \$ 12,457 |
| plant area | | 1,595 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 1,994 | \$ 2,383 | \$ 2,471 | \$ 2,497 | \$ 2,577 | \$ 2,659 |
| crusher area | | 1,810 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 2,263 | \$ 2,705 | \$ 2,804 | \$ 2,834 | \$ 2,924 | \$ 3,018 |
| dump areas | | 13,668 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 17,085 | \$ 20,420 | \$ 21,169 | \$ 21,393 | \$ 22,078 | \$ 22,784 |
| Total-Drainage Diversion Ditches | | | | | \$ 30,683 | \$ 36,672 | \$ 38,017 | \$ 38,420 | \$ 39,649 | \$ 40,918 75% 30,689 |
| Water Line | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 inches soil on top | | 7,582 | CY | 1.25 | \$ 9,478 | \$ 11,328 | \$ 11,744 | \$ 11,868 | \$ 12,248 | \$ 12,640 |
| seed entire surface | | 4.7 | acre | 174 | \$ 818 | \$ 978 | \$ 1,014 | \$ 1,024 | \$ 1,057 | \$ 1,091 |
| Total-Drainage Diversion Ditches | | | | | \$ 10,296 | \$ 12,306 | \$ 12,757 | \$ 12,892 | \$ 13,305 | \$ 13,731 100% 13,731 |
| Drill Pads and Boreholes | | | | | | | | | | |
| Centennial Recess Drilling | | 23 | pads | 350 | | | | \$ 8,050 | \$ 8,258 | \$ 8,689 100% 8,689 |
| Other Miscellaneous Areas | | | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Costs | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mobilization and Demobilization | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | lot | 35,000 | \$ 35,000 | \$ 41,832 | \$ 43,366 | \$ 43,826 | \$ 45,228 | \$ 46,675 |
| | | | combined total of previous items | | \$ 5,533,170 | \$ 6,613,219 | \$ 6,855,748 | \$ 6,928,419 | \$ 7,150,129 | \$ 7,378,933 |
| Leach Pad & Waste Dumps | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | combined total of previous items | | \$ 400,990 | \$ 479,261 | \$ 496,838 | \$ 502,104 | \$ 518,171 | \$ 534,753 |
| Misc. Surface Areas | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | \$ 5,969,160 | \$ 7,134,312 | \$ 7,395,952 | \$ 7,474,349 | \$ 7,713,528 | \$ 7,960,361 |
| Total Direct Costs | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indirect Costs | | | | | | | | | | |
| Plant Dismantling | | | | | | | | | | |
| assumes no salvage value | | 1 | lot | 450,000 | \$ 450,000 | \$ 537,838 | \$ 557,562 | \$ 563,472 | \$ 581,504 | \$ 600,112 |
| Plugging monitoring wells | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5-wells, 500ft | | 2,500 | lf | 2.20 | \$ 5,500 | \$ 6,574 | \$ 6,815 | \$ 6,887 | \$ 7,107 | \$ 7,335 |
| 6-wells 1,200ft | | 14,400 | lf | 3.30 | \$ 47,520 | \$ 56,796 | \$ 58,879 | \$ 59,503 | \$ 61,407 | \$ 63,372 |
| Engineering- 5% of total direct costs | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | lot | 298,458 | \$ 298,458 | \$ 356,716 | \$ 369,798 | \$ 373,717 | \$ 385,676 | \$ 398,018 |
| Owners Cost- OMITTED | | | | | | | | | | |
| Water Quality Monitoring for 11 wells | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 110 | sample | 500 | \$ 55,000 | \$ 65,736 | \$ 68,146 | \$ 68,869 | \$ 71,073 | \$ 73,347 |
| Revegetation monitoring for 5 years | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 5 | year | 5,000 | \$ 25,000 | \$ 29,880 | \$ 30,976 | \$ 31,304 | \$ 32,306 | \$ 33,340 |
| Construction management | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | lot | 180,199 | \$ 180,199 | \$ 215,373 | \$ 223,271 | \$ 225,638 | \$ 232,859 | \$ 240,310 |
| Contingency (10% of Total Direct Costs) | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | lot | 596,916 | \$ 596,916 | \$ 713,431 | \$ 739,595 | \$ 747,435 | \$ 771,353 | \$ 796,036 |
| Total Indirect Costs | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | \$ 1,658,593 | \$ 1,982,342 | \$ 2,055,042 | \$ 2,076,825 | \$ 2,143,284 | \$ 2,211,869 |
| Adjusted Total Costs 2.58%/yr | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | \$ 7,62 | | | | | |